



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/332,298	06/11/1999	YASUSHI ABE	31812	2750

116 7590 07/16/2003
PEARNE & GORDON LLP
526 SUPERIOR AVENUE EAST
SUITE 1200
CLEVELAND, OH 44114-1484

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, NAM V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2635

DATE MAILED: 07/16/2003

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/332,298

Applicant(s)

ABE, YASUSHI

Examiner

Nam V Nguyen

Art Unit

2635

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: _____.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: 1-6 and 15-20.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 7-14 and 21-28.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____

Continuation of 2. NOTE: Referring to claim 11, the amended claim add the limitation that the stored character sequence retrieving means for detecting whether or not designated character sequences are contained in the message data picked up by the first decoding means stored in the data storing means raises new issue that requires further consideration. The amended claims require further search. Therefore, the amended claims will not be entered.

Referring to claims 7 and 21, Vanden Heuvel suggests that when a valid message received and it is a personal selective call message, the memory manager checks for an available memory slot. If no slot is available, the oldest read or oldest unread message is deleted and the next available personal control area slot is made available for message storage. This method would ensure effective utilization of the memory data area (column 9 lines 55 to column 10 lines 9; see Figure 9). Helferich teaches that erasing the messages after the messages have been checked by the user selection function. Helferich also discloses that when a valid message received a selective call, the pager transceiver CPU determine whether an acknowledgment has been enabled. If the acknowledgment has been enabled, the acknowledgment flag is enabled (column 9 lines 58 to 67; see Figure 7). The pager transceiver CPU performs house keeping functions (column 10 lines 1 to 18). The user selects the functions to be performed from available functions such as retrieve, erase or save message (column 10 lines 19 to 30; see Figure 8). One of ordinary skill in the art understand that a user select an erase function after the received message is read, the received message is marked in order for the pager transceiver CPU knows that a particular message erased after the process function is performed. Therefore, Helferich teaches or suggests deleting a message once it is checked by the user. Nowhere in the claims state that the messages are automatically deleted by the radio paging receiver in response to designated character sequences being contained in the received message as applicant's arguments.

nn

MICHAEL HORABIK
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

